EXHIBIT 2

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA 2 AT HUNTINGTON 3 IN RE: : MDL NO. : 2:12-MD-02327 4 ETHICON INC., PELVIC REPAIR SYSTEM 5 PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION 6 x 7 8 9 TELEPHONIC HEARING 10 BEFORE THE HONORABLE 11 CHERYL A. EIFERT UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 12 THURSDAY FEBRUARY 6, 2014 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 CATHERINE L. SCHUTTE-STANT, RPR, RMR Federal Official Court Reporter 21 300 Virginia Avenue East Room 6009 22 Charleston, WV 25301 (304) 347-315123 24 25

that if you've already covered this ground and you just failed to ask certain questions — and I do specifically recall reading testimony by Mr. Mittenthal where he said that some people didn't understand what their obligations were, so that was already stated in the testimony. And I don't think the deposition ought to be an opportunity for you now to go ask questions you did not ask the first time.

It would be an opportunity for you to reformat the testimony in a way that makes it easier for the jury to understand, but not to actually go plow new ground.

MR. FREESE: Your Honor, I understand.

THE COURT: Having said that, I think the plaintiffs should be able to take this. This is an important point to their case.

I still want to point out that, you know, one of the big problems I had with the spoliation motion, I mean obviously documents were destroyed that were probably -- some of them probably relevant to your case under the definition of relevance for spoliation. But, you know, I still didn't see the prejudice. I didn't see the smoking gun like you had in Actos. I didn't see anything there that made me think that you're missing something really crucial to your case, which is what you almost need to have to get an adverse inference instruction. And I just didn't see that.